



June 2004 Edition

Acquisition Update

A Joint Resources Council (JRC) was held on May 3, 2004. The JRC allows Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) senior executives the opportunity to confer on agency mission needs and investments in acquisition programs. Information provided prior to and during the JRC meeting is intended to allow for an informed decision by the council members. The JRC's concurrence to proceed with the Automated Flight Service Station (AFSS) competition was required prior to the release of the final Screening Information Request (SIR).

After receiving concurrence from the JRC to proceed, the final SIR was released on May 3rd. As part of the release, potential service providers were required to provide a written notice of intent no later than May 12, 2004, indicating their intent to submit a proposal in response to the SIR. All six remaining service providers provided the Contracting Officer a notice of intent; so, the competition continues with the Most Efficient Organization (MEO), Computer Science Corporation, Lockheed Martin, Northrup Grumman, Raytheon, and Wade & Associates.

As part of the final SIR, the Office of Competitive Sourcing asked potential service providers to submit requests for clarification by May 20, 2004. All competitors provided requests for clarification. The impact of the resulting changes required that an amendment be released.

The amended SIR, released on June 10, 2004, can be accessed on the Office of Competitive Sourcing website at <http://www.faa.gov/aca/afss/documents.htm>. The SIR data is posted under Competition Documents.

AFSS Implementation Office

The AFSS Implementation Office is a new addition to the Office of Competitive Sourcing. This group will ensure a seamless transition from the current AFSS operations environment to a MEO or private sector environment. Marilyn Jackson-Brame will lead this group's efforts.

The AFSS Implementation Office is separate from the Flight Services Transition Office, which was created by the Flight Services Service Unit and is led by Joe Justiniano. There will be initial coordination between the offices as both the Implementation Office and the Transition Office define the mission of their respective organizations. More information will be shared as it becomes available.

To assist both offices in accomplishing their mission, Dennis DeGaetano (Vice President for Acquisition and Business Services, ATO-A) and Jim Washington (Vice President for Flight Services, ATO-D) signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The MOA outlines expectations for how the flight services representatives from ATO-D detailed to the Office of Competitive Sourcing will operate, as well as the roles and responsibilities of both the AFSS Implementation Office and the Flight Services Transition Office.

As part of this agreement, ATO-D will provide up to three operational experts to work with the AFSS Implementation Office. These individuals must adhere to the strict firewall boundaries in place with the MEO. These experts will have the authority to speak on behalf of Jim Washington, who cannot participate in the activity due to his role as the Agency Tender Official.

Human Resources Action Team Executive Oversight

An executive oversight team has been created to identify issues for the Human Resources Action Team (HRAT) to work and to ensure that the human resource (HR) issues are addressed in a timely manner. Team members include Dennis DeGaetano and Joann Kansier (ATO-A), Ventris Gibson (AHR) and Jim Washington and Nancy Kalinowski (ATO-D), as well as members of their respective staffs. This team meets monthly to discuss HR issues as they relate to the progress of the competition.

Additionally, Pilar Madera and Suzanne Hynes from the Office of Competitive Sourcing, have been named as members of the HRAT. As previously reported, all personnel-related information will be shared with field personnel by either the Office of Human Resource Management (AHR) or the Flight Services Service Unit. Personnel-related questions regarding the AFSS A-76 competition that are directed to Suzanne or Pilar will be forwarded to the HRAT. The AHR members of the team will forward the question to the appropriate expert to answer. The answer will then be reviewed by the HRAT. Once the team agrees on the answer, a response will be provided to the employee who asked the question and the question and answer will be posted on the AHR website (<http://www.faa.gov/ahr/competitive.cfm>).

Evaluation of Proposals

The due date for technical proposals from potential service providers is August 3, 2004, and the cost proposals are due September 2, 2004.

The evaluation of these proposals will enable the Agency to determine which one represents the best value to the Government. Best value will be the combination of the impact of the overall benefits, risk and cost for the delivery of effective flight services to support safe and efficient flight.

The Government will evaluate all proposals in terms of one Past Performance Factor, one Cost Factor, and four Technical Factors. The Agency Tender is not required to submit past performance information and will not be evaluated for the Past Performance Factor. The Technical Factors are Phase-In, Staffing and Management, Service Delivery, and Performance Management.

Additional information on the evaluation process is available in Section M of the SIR.

Office of Competitive Sourcing Activities

Marilyn Jackson-Brame and Joann Kansier addressed the AFSS Leadership Conference on May 4, 2004. Their presentation was followed by a lively question and answer session. This was the first time that Joann had the opportunity to interface with a large group of employees directly affected by the A-76 competition. She fielded many tough questions. Tapes or DVDs of the conference are available at all AFSSs.

The National Council for Public-Private Partnerships (<http://www.ncppp.org>) sponsored a forum on June 2, 2004, entitled: Revisiting the Revised A-76 Circular: Evaluations After One Year. Joann Kansier was a member of the 'Competition Experts Review' panel, which also included David Childs (Department of Homeland Security), William Roberts (Wiley Rein & Fielding), and Rick Rohdenburg (Food and Drug Administration). Joann discussed lessons learned over the past year, problematic characteristics of the AFSS acquisition, and hurdles to the competition that have been overcome.

Highlighted Recently Asked Questions

Have monies been set aside to fund the AFSS contract once the competition award is announced? Does Congress have the ability to withhold funds once the contract is awarded?

One of the advantages of this competition is that it results in either a Letter of Obligation (to the MEO) or contract (to a private vendor). It is the Agency's intention that either of these documents will spell out specific resources that would be allocated to AFSS services and certain performance that would be provided in return. One can never say that the Congress is going to or not going to do anything; however, in dealing with Agency decision makers, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Hill, the Office of Competitive Sourcing would be able to support funding requests by referring to these binding agreements. If the appropriate funding is then not forthcoming, negotiations would have to be held to revise the terms and conditions of those agreements.

The PWS says service providers are responsible for filing flight plans. Could a contractor say filing does not include transmitting?

The Office of Competitive Sourcing interprets filing to include transmit and the service provider would be required to transmit flight plans. The winning service provider will be required to handle operations in accordance with FAA Handbook 7110.10 (unless a deviation is proposed and approved).



Website Updates

From May 1, 2004, through June 14, 2004, the Office of Competitive Sourcing website (<http://www.faa.gov/aca>) had over 8,000 visitors, averaging approximately 178 per day.

Recent updates to the website include:

- SIR Amendment 001
- Updated content in “Questions and Answers”

The Financial Services (ABA) competitive services website (http://www.faa.gov/aba/html_budget/html_cs) has been updated. The frequently asked questions and answers (FAQs) on this site have been reviewed and revised as appropriate. All personnel-related FAQs were removed, since they are now addressed on the AHR website.